

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.weylo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,467	10/07/2005	Tetsujiro Kondo	278694US6PCT	2209
OBLON SPIX	7590 08/24/201 YAK, MCCLELLAND	EXAM	EXAMINER	
1940 DUKE STREET			THIRUGNANAM, GANDHI	
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/24/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10552467	10/7/2005	KONDO ET AL	278694US6PCT

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

GANDHI THIRUGNANAM

ART UNIT PAPER

2624 The

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The Reply Brief filed on 8/2/2010 is entered and considered by the Examiner, Responses are provided below.

The Examiner acknowledges Applicant's arguments.

In response to Applicant's new argument (1):

The original claim 1 language states

"detecting a motion vector about a moving object that moves in multiple images..." and "combining the motion-blurring-mitigated object image ... into into a space-time location, in each image, corresponding to the motion vector...".

The amended claim language states

"combining the motion-blurring mitigated object image ... into space-time location in each of the multiple images based on the motion vector".

The detecting a motion vector is determined for

">an object that that is moving in multiple images. The motion vector is not based on all the multiple images. The motion-blurring-mitigated object image is combined in each image corresponding to the motion vector, not each of the multiple images.

In response to Applicant's argument (2):

The Examiner agrees that the motion-blurring-mitigated object image can be combined in the first image, the issue is if it can be combined in each of the multiple images. For instance see the Examiners Answer dated 02 June 2010 (hereafter referred to as EA) pg. 8 the two drawings on the bottom and pg. 9 paragraph 2-3. This is not each of the multiple images.

In response to Applicant's argument(3):

Applicant is confusing the issue by pointing to a typo in their specification. OBf represents the moving object and Dbf represents the motion-blurring mitigated object. By even reading the paragraph that Applicant points to pg. 47 lines 1-11, One can see (line 2) "motion blurring of an moving object OBf", (line 3) "when the moving object OBf", (line 6) "of this moving object OBf", (line 10) "the moving object OBf". The Examiner also pointed to many other location in the original disclosure (See EA pg. 15).

In response to conclusion:

This claim limitation is clearly not supported expressly nor in ipsis verbis. If Applicant intends to argue that it is implicitly or inherently disclosed, then it would stand to reason the the 102(b) prior art reference (PGPub 2004/0021775, which does not teach the new matter in question, as argued in Remarks dated April 27, 2009), with overlapping inventorship, same assignee, same field of endeavor, similar concepts, also would implicitly or inherently disclose this limitation.

/Wenpeng Chen/ Primary Examiner, AU 2624 /Gandhi Thirugnanam/ Examiner, Art Unit 2624

PTO-90C (Rev.04-03)